

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 53 are currently pending
- No claims are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 13 and 53 are amended herein

**[0003]** Support for the amendments to claims is found in the specification at least on pages 17-18 and in dependent claim 13.

## **Cited Documents**

**[0004]** Maissel: Maissel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,637,029.

**[0005]** Herz: Herz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257.

**[0006]** Neal: Neal et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,324,532.

**[0007]** Heckerman: Heckerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,704,017.

## **§103 Rejections**

**[0008]** Claims 1-7, 9-18, 32-34 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being obvious over Maissel in view of Herz, Neal and Heckerman.

[0009] Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant has amended independent claim 1.

[00010] **Independent claim 1**, as amended, recites a system for ranking items in a selectable information list received from an information delivery system, comprising:  
(Underlined text indicates amended language):

- a database system that logs selections of information viewed by local users of the information delivery system and tags each of the logged selections of information with a corresponding time subinterval from a plurality of time subintervals that relates to a respective viewing of the selected information;
- a filtering component that forms a temporally filtered reviewed items list that includes a subset of the logged selections of information viewed by the local users, the subset chosen to incorporate the logged selections tagged with a particular one of the plurality of time subintervals that includes a target time period for providing a recommendation, the temporally filtered reviewed items list provides implicit evidence of content preferences associated with a likely subset of the local users that employs the information delivery system during the particular one of the plurality of time subintervals;
- a collaborative filtering system that infers the content preferences associated with the likely subset of the local users by utilizing the subset of the logged selections included in the temporally filtered reviewed items list as an input, and generates the recommendation specific to the inferred, likely subset of the local users based at least in part on the inferred content preferences and information obtained from a plurality of global users related to the particular one of the plurality of time subintervals, wherein the filtering component comprises a popularity filter that selects a recommendation based, at least in part, by multiplying a collaborative filter score of a recommendation by the probability that the user does not know of the selection; and
- a user interface that displays the recommendation.

[00011] Maissel is directed to an "Intelligent Electronic Program Guide." (Maissel, Title)  
Maissel recites "[t]he optional viewer preference profile loading apparatus 160, if

present, may be used to load a recorded viewer preference profile of another viewer.” (Maissel, Col. 14, lines 54-56) Maissel further recites “[i]t is appreciated that other factors in addition to a viewer preference profile may also be applied by the intelligent agent 130. Examples of such other factors and their typical use by the intelligent agent 130 include the following: parental control information,...subscription information,...rating information,...and language choice information.” (Maissel, Col. 14, lines 20-46) However, Maissel does not teach or suggest “the filtering component comprises a popularity filter that selects a recommendation based, at least in part, by multiplying a collaborative filter score of a recommendation by the probability that the user does not know of the selection,” as recited in amended claim 1. In fact, Maissel is silent with respect to a popularity filter that uses both a collaborative filter score and the probability that the user does not know of the selection.

**[00012]** Independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate a portion of dependent claim 13. The Office has rejected dependent claim 13 in a similar manner as claim 1 as being obvious over Maissel in view of Herz, Neal and Heckerman. However, the Office only cites Maissel in rejecting dependent claim 13. (Office Action, pages 8-9) Applicant respectfully submits that Herz, Neal and Heckerman are silent with respect to the claimed elements of dependent claim 13 and do not teach or suggest the language of claim 1 as amended.

**[00013]** Consequently, Maissel in view of Herz, Neal and Heckerman do not teach all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Maissel, Herz, Neal and

Heckerman, whether taken alone or in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above.

**[00014] Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-16** depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each recites.

**[00015] Claims 18 and 32-34** were previously withdrawn in the Restriction Requirement Response file August 24, 2009.

**[00016] Independent claim 53** is rejected as being obvious over Maisse in view of Herz, Neal and Heckerman for similar reasons as claim 1. Claim 53 is allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above in regards to claim 1.

## **Conclusion**

**[00017]** Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/ Dated: December 30, 2009  
Dale G. Mohlenhoff (dalem@leehayes.com; 509-944-4738)  
Registration No. 37,683

Dan L. Hayes  
Registration No. 34,618